

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,913	01/17/2006	Josephus Arnoldus Henricus Kahlman	FR030080	5337
	7590 09/24/2007 LLECTUAL PROPERT	TY & STANDARDS	EXAM	INER
P.O. BOX 3001			PYO, KEVIN K	
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		• .	2878	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		09/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			σH
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,913 KAHLMAN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Pyo	2878	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addres	is
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo , cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this commu ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_ ·		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	•	·	rits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ drawing(s) be held in abey tion is required if the drawir	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stag	ge
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: ____.

Application/Control Number: 10/564,913

Art Unit: 2878

Double Patenting

Page 2

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/558,717. Although the claims of the copending application differs from the claims of the present application in that they recite "a plurality of information layers", as opposed to the claims of the present application which recite "at least one information layer", they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to broaden the claims to achieve greater scope while avoiding the prior art. The specific receiving means and the specific decoding means utilized would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of meeting different design requirements and achieving the particular desired performance.

Application/Control Number: 10/564,913

Art Unit: 2878

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Page 3

- 3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Terao et al (6,977,883) is cited for disclosing an information recording medium having a pair of electrodes. Van Der Mark (US 2006/0152789) is cited for disclosing multi-stack rolled-up information carrier.
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Pyo whose telephone number is (571) 272-2445. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (with flexible hour), First Mon. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y. Epps can be reached on (571) 272-2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

Art Unit: 2878

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin Pyo

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2878

Kp 9/15/07